THE

PRIMITIVE CHURCH

(OR BAPTIST)

MAGAZINE.

No. CCXLVII.—JULY 1, 1864.

Essays, Expositions, &c.

THE EARLY "FATHERS" ON BAPTISM.

(A Lecture.—Delivered by request.)

1 Thes. v. 21.

My attention having been directed recently to a sermon on "Infant Baptism," published in Manchester, and in which great stress is laid on the testimony of the ancient fathers in favour of the practice, I now proceed, at the urgent request of several in this congregation, to show *what amount* of evidence the testimony of the early fathers furnishes in favour of the practice alluded to. On reëxamining this subject, I have no hesitation in declaring it as my belief, that we have evidence as strong as the nature of the case admits of, *that during the first two centuries of the Christian era, infant baptism was altogether unknown in the church.* The writings of the fathers of that period have been ransacked for traces of it in vain. Barnabas, Hermes, Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, have been examined and reëxamined, but no certain evidence can be extracted from any of them, though every one of them alludes more or less to the baptism of *believers.* If the truth of this statement can be established, you will admit that there is strong historical evidence against the practice of infant baptism. For it is irrational to suppose that such a practice could prevail, or even *exist*, for 200 years in the church, and not be mentioned or hinted at by any of the writers that appeared in all that time, especially as the rite in question is one which lies at the very threshold of the Christian temple, and to which the Christian writers of the times make abundant allusions.

It has been alleged that some of the writers we have named furnish distinct and unambiguous evidence that infant baptism was practised in their day. Let us examine the allegation. And, first, let us examine Tertullian, as the last writer of the second century. It is affirmed that what he says "proves that all infants had been baptised up to his time." His testimony then must be admitted to be very important. What then does it amount to? A certain lady wrote to Tertullian to ask whether *little ones* might not be baptised, provided they *came and asked for it.* To which this father replies, that "Baptism ought not to be administered rashly, the administrators of it know—'Give to him that asketh thee—every one has a right,' as if it were a matter of alms.

. . . If Philip baptised the eunuch upon the spot, let us remember that it was done under the immediate direction of the Lord. But 'Paul,' you will say, 'was baptised instantly.' True, because Judas, in whose house he was, instantly knew that he was a vessel of mercy. The condescension of God may confer his favours as he pleases, but our wishes *may mislead ourselves and others*. It is therefore most expedient to defer baptism, and to regulate the administration of it according to the condition, the disposition, and the age of the persons to be baptised, and especially in the case of little ones. Indeed the Lord saith, 'Forbid them not to come.' Let them come then till they grow up, let them come till they learn whither they are coming, and let them profess Christianity when they know Christ. They know just how to ask salvation, that you may seem to give to him that asketh. Such as understand the importance of baptism are more afraid of presumption than of procrastination, and faith alone secures salvation."

Let it be remembered that we are no further concerned with Tertullian than as a witness to the fact of infant baptism, and in respect to this I remark,

1. That neither in this passage, nor (I believe) in any that Tertullian wrote, is the practice of infant baptism at all alluded to. The word he uses is not *infants*, but *parvuli*, *little ones*, who were capable of *coming* and *asking*. That Tertullian's *parvuli* were not infants, see *De Jejuniis* 8, *De exhortatione castitatis* 9. The truth is that he uses the word, as a writer in the "Cornhill Magazine," 1860, does, who, speaking of the little ones assembling in the "immense temple" at Antwerp, says—"If I thought the teaching was the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, I would go and sit down on the form *cum parvulis*, and learn the precious lesson with all my heart."

2. It is not a profession by proxy, but a *personal* profession of Christianity that is here in question. It is assumed on both sides, that baptism was out of the question unless there was a personal application for it. The references to Philip and Paul, as well as the conditions on which baptism was requested, show this. Sponsors, indeed, are mentioned. But it is well known that from a very early period in the history of the Christian church, sponsors were required in the baptism of believers of all ages. The question Tertullian was called upon to answer, was, whether the passages, "Give to him that asketh thee"—"Forbid them not to come," would not justify the extension of baptism to little ones who were taught to come and ask for it. Tertullian could have made no adequate reply to this question without alluding to the practice of infant baptism, if such a practice had then been known. He makes no allusion however to it at all. To the passage, "Give to him that asketh thee," he replies, "Baptism is not a matter of alms;" to the passage, "Forbid them not to come," he replies, "We need not forbid them to come; only let them come in the proper order—first to learn Christ, and then to profess him." This was at the close of the second century, and I have referred to this father first, because the second century furnishes no later writer, and I think it will be admitted that if infant baptism did not exist in his day, it will be a hard thing to prove its previous existence. As it is alleged, however, that other writers, before Tertullian, bear testimony to the prevalence of infant baptism, let us go backward through these two centuries, examining their testimony, in order, on our way back to the apostolic age.

The first we meet is Clement Alexandrinus, who flourished not long before Tertullian. This writer is represented as saying to those who were fishermen, that "they ought to have upon their rings the representation of an *apostle baptising infants*." Why *fishermen*, rather than those who follow any other calling, should adopt the representation of "an apostle baptising infants," is not now the subject of enquiry. The point is to ascertain whether Clement "assumes," in the passage referred to, that the apostles baptised infants. "Little children, let no man deceive you." Here is the passage itself. "Let your seal be a dove, or a fish, or a ship under sail, as was that of Polycrates, or an anchor, which Selencus made his choice; and if any one be by trade a

fisherman, he will do well to think of an apostle, and the children taken out of the water." You know that Jesus addressed his disciples as children, that the apostle John delighted in this name, and Clement himself says, comparing Christ to a pedagogue and his disciples to children, "The baptised ought to be children, even children of God, who have put off the old man," &c. Surely there is a difference between assuming that the apostles baptised infants, and saying that fishermen "would do well to think of an apostle and the children taken out of the water." That baptism is referred to here, there can be no doubt; but the point and beauty of the passage lie in this, that fishermen, when they drag the net full of newly-caught fishes out of the water, would do well to think of the first gospel fishermen, who caught so many souls at the first letting down of the gospel net, and received them issuing from the waters of baptism as new-born converts to the truth. Hence nothing could be more appropriate to the occupation of a fisherman, than a reference to "an apostle and the children taken out of the water." Any reference to infant baptism here would have marred the appropriateness and beauty of the passage.

The next writer on our way back that is supposed to bear testimony in favour of infant baptism is Irenæus. Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons, and suffered martyrdom A.D. 202. Here is his testimony:—"Christ came to save all persons, all, I mean, who by him are *regenerated* unto God—infants, little ones, and young men and aged persons." It is urged in exposition of this passage that "the fathers always used the words *regenerated* and *baptised* indiscriminately." And is it so, then, that because the fathers used these two words indiscriminately, that *therefore*, when the one is used, the other is *always* meant? What is there in this passage to fix the meaning of *regenerated* to the sense put upon it? Because it *sometimes* means baptised in the writings of the fathers, must it *always* mean baptised? But if there be nothing to fix baptism as the reference, the testimony is indistinct and equivocal, and such testimony is worthless. Further, the passage contains sufficient evidence that *baptism* is *not* meant. Look at it again. "Christ came to save all persons, who *by him* are regenerated unto God." "By Him." "This is He that baptiseth with the Holy Ghost." Christ was not then on earth to baptise with water, and when he was on earth, Jesus himself baptised not. To be regenerated *by Him*, is to be regenerated indeed. Besides, the contrary supposition would make Irenæus say that all the baptised are saved, and there is no occasion to suppose him devoid of common sense. If we suppose Irenæus to mean just what he says, he speaks both sound doctrine and good sense. He *says* that all, of whatever age, who are *regenerated unto God by Christ*, are partakers of salvation. There is no need to enquire further what he *meant*.

The next we find on our way back to the apostolic age is Justin Martyr. He is said to have flourished about A.D. 150. It is asserted that Justin *distinctly says*, that certain Christians, being sixty or seventy years old, "had been baptised in their infancy." We are now close upon the apostolic age, when a distinct testimony must needs be of great value. Let us quote Justin's words. "Certain persons, now sixty or seventy years old, have been discipled from childhood, and have continued uncorrupt." And how is this language transubstantiated into a distinct testimony to the prevalence of infant baptism? Thus. *Discipled*, means *dedicated to God by parents; childhood*, means *infancy*. Hence infant baptism. And is it expected that this should close the controversy? Who knows that the word *discipled* here means *dedicated to God by parents?* And who knows that the word *childhood* here means *infancy?* The same word in Acts (xx. 12) is used to designate Eutychus, who was then a "young man." The gloss put on Justin's words reminds us of the saying of the "judicious Hooker"—"There is nothing more dangerous than the licentious and deluding art, which changeth the meaning of words, as alchymy doth or would do the substance of metals; maketh of any thing what it listeth, and bringeth in the end all truth to nothing." The words "discipled from childhood" are easily understood, without supposing that they contain "a

distinct testimony to infant baptism;" for, even if the word "discipled" refers to baptism, the profession involved may as well have been personal as by proxy. Reflect, besides, on the words of the context—"*remain uncorrupt.*" They are suggestive. "Discipled from childhood, and *remain uncorrupt.*" Does it mean "were baptised in infancy, and remain baptised;" or, does it not rather mean "professed themselves Christ's disciples, and continued to act in accordance with their profession." But if Justin has not a word to say for infant baptism, his testimony is distinct enough in regard to believers' baptism; for, in his "Apology for Christians," he tells the emperor, "I shall now lay before you the manner of dedicating ourselves to God through Christ upon *our conversion*; for should I omit this, I might not seem to deal sincerely in this account of our religion. As many as *are persuaded* and *believe* that those things that are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to them, are directed first to pray and ask God with fasting the forgiveness of their sins: and we also pray and fast together with them. They are *then* conducted by us to a place where there is water, and they are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated, for they are then washed in the name of God the Father and Lord of the Universe." On this statement, Dr. Wall, the great champion of infant baptism, observes—"This is the most ancient account of the way of baptising next to the Scriptures, and shows the plain and simple manner of administering it. The Christians of these times had lived, many of them at least, in the days of the apostles." Does it not show with equal clearness to whom the ordinance was then administered?

Another testimony adduced is that of Clemens Romanus, of whom Bingham says—"The most ancient writer we have is Clemens Romanus, who lived in the time of the apostles; and he, though he does not directly mention infant baptism, yet says a thing that by consequence proves it, for he makes infants *liable to original sin*, which is *in effect* to say, that they have need of *baptism* to purge them from it." That Clemens does not *directly* mention infant baptism, is a presumption *against* it; and that he bears testimony to the *need of it*, without recognising the existence of it, strengthens that presumption. Nor was this the only opportunity his subject afforded Clemens of alluding to the baptism of infants, for in speaking of the persons who ought to be baptised, he says—"*They* are the right subjects of baptism who have passed through an examination and instruction."

We find no trace of infant baptism in any of the writings of the fathers of the first two centuries. But many unscriptural practices, claiming for their origin apostolic tradition, were introduced and established during these 200 years, and of which no record tells us the *time when*, or the *manner in which*, they first obtained a footing. Thus Tertullian says of certain practices as that of Christians signing themselves on the forehead with the sign of the cross—"If you search in the Scriptures for any command for these and such like usages, you shall find none. Tradition will be urged to you as the ground of them, custom as the confirmer of them, and our religion teaches us to observe them." And Justin, who wrote forty-five years before Tertullian, affirms that "the church received a tradition from the apostles sanctioning the custom of praying to the east." Why, among all these customs, is not infant baptism alluded to? Why do the writers of the first two centuries systematically ignore it? Were they not ignorant of it?

(To be continued.)

A DESPISED SAVIOUR.

ISAIAH liii. 3.

IF we were ignorant of the birth and office of Isaiah, we should call him the historian rather than the prophet. He writes more like an eye witness, than a distant foreteller of the Messiah's life. His favourite themes are Christ's coming, Christ's sufferings, Christ's success. If, for a while, he digress, to

point us to the downfall of dynasties, and the doom of individuals, he quickly recalls our attention to the Coming One, whose titles bespoke dignity, as his suffering and work bespoke his love. All the Messiah's life seems to lie stretched out before the prophet's mind, as the gliding river, and wooded slopes, and villages, lie beneath the glance of the traveller on a mountain summit. Other prophets wrote of Christ, but most of them merely by occasional allusions and ambiguous imagery. Isaiah, however, writes His life-history from the manger to the crown. His prophecies were in the hands of the Jewish priests. They had the privilege of studying, and, of course, conceiving a truthful opinion of the character the Messiah would assume. Taught from infancy to venerate the prophets, and led to expect from departed progenitors the speedy coming of Christ, one would think the perusal of Isaiah's prophecies would have led them to believe the twofold aspect of the Messiah's person—the sorrowful as well as the joyous, the humiliation as well as the crowning honours. But the Jews were not the only race of people who have drawn wrong inferences from partial and superficial knowledge. They saw only one part of the prophecies. They read of crowns, and thrones, and sceptres, and a wide-spread kingdom, and a crowned king; and, immediately, fancy, aided by selfish motives, pictured the coming Messiah as the head of a pompous monarchy, to which every other nation should bow, and every people be subjugated. They saw not, or would not see, that the crown was behind the cross. They read of His sufferings with a veil before their eyes, whilst they eagerly caught at every prophecy which favoured their ideal monarchy. With such erroneous conceptions, they were not prepared to receive Christ. They were less prepared than if they had been entirely ignorant. Their minds would be less susceptible of good impressions. Their early formed opinion would shut them up to one view of Christ. They stood on a lower level than even heathens. Excellence will commend itself and win its way to the hearts of men, where prejudice and superstition have not fettered their minds; but truth, however plain, however excellent, has much to overcome before it gains a lodgement in the hearts of those who have been early trained to foster a half-formed *orthodoxy*. When Christ came, he did not realise their expectations, and because he did not, he was despised as mean, rejected as an impostor, and crucified as a criminal. That treatment will be the subject of the present paper. We may remark that the treatment *awakens our astonishment*. *He* was despised. If we remember the perfect character of Jesus, in contrast with his reception, we read this statement with surprise. That impostors—public men, angel-like in appearance, but rotten at the heart—should be despised, is just and reasonable; but that men, who combine every virtue with a philanthropic life, should be despised, their motives misinterpreted, and their mission rejected, is not only unjust, but, at first sight, inexplicable. And yet such was the Messiah, and such his reception. If we draw the outlines of His superhuman character, we shall be the more astonished at that blindness that prevented an appreciation of his worth. He was *the only perfect model of virtue*. Before His coming, philosophers had attempted, but always failed, to sketch the picture of perfect manhood. Many of them believed that if any man appeared on earth, exhibiting a perfect life, he would be universally admired and imitated. Hence they longed to witness what they considered so desirable. And when one dissentient voice from among the circle of philosophers declared his belief in the too-prevalent love of vice, and the consequent rejection of even a perfect man, that voice was soon drowned, and the darling opinion was fostered by the majority. God tried its value. He sent his Son. In Him virtue found an exponent, as well as an embodiment. Sinless, He challenged accusation. No voice accepted it. No one arose to charge Him with an outburst of passion, a mean motive, an unguarded expression, a slight fall from the lofty pinnacle of perfection. And how was this model valued? Did the world pay homage to it? Did the people strive after a distant imitation? Did they admire what was so much above them, and rejoice that

a high standard was now erected, if it were never attained unto by the emulators? No. Jesus was too pure for their impurity. His sinless presence put too great a check upon their vices, and revealed an awful chasm between both. And instead of being loved and imitated, He was despised and rejected. And if to the perfect model of virtue you add *His unexampled teaching*, his reception appears the more censurable. He taught plainly, what hitherto had been taught ambiguously. He solved the greatest of life's problems. Before He came, the greatest philosophers merely uttered sublime guesses about immortality; he brought it to light. They thought a resurrection probable; He showed it to be possible and certain. They put the ladder of virtue to the feet of the aspirant for immortality, and bade him climb by his own efforts; He came to be the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*. They spoke of a deserved retribution and the sweetness of revenge; He told of a hell, at whose awful portals justice sat enthroned. And if He taught plainly, how powerfully did he enforce his teaching. The voice of the divine was heard coming from the lips of the human—a voice so powerful that the tempests ceased their warfare, and the ocean her troubled surgings, when He spoke; the dead leaped into life, the demoniac was again a man, sightless eyeballs lost their film, and the deaf ears their awful silence. Why did not such a plain and powerful Teacher become popular?—popular, so as to be generally loved—loved so intensely as to gather round him a circle of humanity so vast as to shut out all attempts to injure him? Why was so unparalleled a Teacher despised, rejected, and crucified? We will try and answer, for we think His treatment *admits of explanation*. We have already alluded to the high expectations of the Jewish nation—how they looked for majesty and pomp in the person of their Deliverer. With such erroneous hopes, it is not surprising that they stumbled at *His humiliation*. His origin to them was mean. They could not trace His being upward to the Son of Jesse. As the son of a carpenter, they could not conceive how He could possess royal claims. His birth to them was a great anomaly. They never associated a lowly manger with the birth of their King. The palace, or the temple, was to them a fitter place. How so much majesty could reside beneath so much meanness, staggered their reason and confounded their faith. His appearance showed no more signs of royalty than his birth. He wore no flowing robe, nor carried a golden sceptre. Gems flashed not in the diadem upon His brow, nor did the palace with its royal affinities receive his person. "The foxes had holes, the birds of the air had nests, but the Son of Man had not where to lay his head." And if a birth so humble, and an appearance so incongruous to kingly power, marked His life, the greater humiliation of his death must have increased the incredulity which his life had already caused. There was much meaning in that challenge which the mob gave to Christ on the cross—"If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross, and we will believe thee." They felt so confident of the greatness of *their* Messiah, and so confident of his *coming*, and so confident that he would never submit to such *treatment*, that they wanted then some superhuman evidence to convince them of his greatness. But if they stumbled at His humiliation, much more did they stumble at the *greatness of his pretensions*. When he stood amongst them as Teacher, he made them feel there was a great distance between the Speaker and the hearer. However much they might dislike the contrast, and plume themselves upon an equality, He did not scruple to say, "Ye are from beneath—I am from above; ye are of the world—I am not of the world." Perhaps they might have endured this, but when He claimed a superiority over all his predecessors, they listened with amazement. They heard Him place his own being far above the founder of their temple and their most noted prophets. "A greater than Solomon, a greater than Jonah is here." As yet He had not touched the character of the idol of the Jews—that name which was venerable for its antiquity and associations. They were not prepared to hear Him say, "Abraham saw my day, and was glad." The quickly put question shows how irritated they were—"Art thou greater than our father Abraham?" But His

answer aroused all their fire—"Before Abraham was, I am." Had Jesus claimed no greater superiority, he would have estranged himself from their respect; but when he rose above all human comparisons, and claimed an equality with God, their contempt reached its climax, and they sought to stone him as a blasphemer before God. They could not make His humiliation and such pretensions agree. We must add to His pretensions the *greatness of his claims upon his hearers* Jesus stood amongst his hearers, not to point out the way to God, but to declare *himself* the way. Contrary to all His predecessors, he transferred trust from God to himself. As the Pharisees listened, they might wonder what had become of the old words, "Trust ye in the Lord for ever, for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength"—"Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm." They would wonder who He was, who, putting aside these words, said, "Believe in me." Such claims staggered their faith. And to make these claims the greater, they were enforced with such exclusiveness as to give the hearer no opportunity of being saved otherwise than by trusting in Him. The same voice that gave the invitation, "Believe in me," informed them of the consequence of its non-acceptance—"If ye believe not that I am he, ye thall die in your sins." If these things be considered, together with the fact of the deep-rooted enmity of the human heart against God, we may easily conceive that the rejection of Christ would be the natural result of their opinions. That the Saviour's treatment was *highly criminal*, and yet *not exceptional*, we purpose showing in another paper. In the meantime, let us rejoice that *we* need not say of ourselves, "He *is* despised;" but he *was;* for to us, he, who, in the days of our ignorance, was "as a root out of a dry ground," is now "the chiefest among ten thousand," yea "the altogether lovely." And if amongst the readers of this paper a despiser is found, we would remind him of the *character* of the Despised, and whilst informing him that until his blindness is removed, he will see no beauty in the Saviour, we would also remind him of the terrible words, "Upon whomsoever this stone shall fall, it shall grind him to powder," and also of the great fact that when "he cometh in the clouds, every eye shall see him," and the character of the inviting Saviour will merge into the office of the impartial Judge.

Milnsbridge. J. T. JONES.

"THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST THE POWER OF GOD UNTO SALVATION."—ROM. i. 16.

Preached at Salem Chapel, Meard's Court, on behalf of the Baptist Evangelical Society,

BY THE REV. JAMES WEBB, IPSWICH.

"I AM not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," was the avowal of one whose whole life confirmed the truth of the testimony. The faithfulness and zeal with which the apostle published and defended that gospel in his ministry and writings; the sufferings, perils, and death which he dared on its behalf; clearly proved that, whoever might blush for the gospel, he never did. Yea, not only was he "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ,"—it was the theme of his loftiest exultation. "God forbid," he exclaims, "that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."

In the verse which contains our text, the apostle produces his "strong reasons" why he was "not ashamed of the gospel." Those reasons were found in what the gospel *was*—"the gospel of Christ;" in what the gospel *did*—it was "the power of God unto salvation." To the subject which these few emphatic words present, I would now direct your thoughts.

Let us consider.

I. THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL.

Observe,

1. *The nature of the gospel.*

It is "*the gospel;*" to perishing sinners it has "good news" for its message; it is "the gospel *of Christ;*" it has Him for its origin, substance, and end.

(1.) The gospel was *from* Christ. He was its herald.

The great purpose of His mission was that he "should bear witness unto the truth." The gospel, in its source, doctrines, precepts, and prospects, was set forth by the Saviour. It has been objected, "Christ did not proclaim, or, at any rate, did not give much prominence to what are called the "fundamental doctrines of the gospel." If the objection were valid, this comparative reserve could be fairly accounted for. During the ministry of the Saviour, most of the leading facts of his history, on which those doctrines were founded, had not occurred. The newly-risen orb of day is a sun, although it has not attained meridian splendour. But the objection scarcely holds good; for Christ did declare the truths in question. For example, His supreme divinity (John x. 30; v. 23), his sacrificial death (Matt. xx. 28; John x. 15), the work of the Holy Spirit (John vi. 63; iii. 3—8), the sovereignty of God (Matt. xi. 25, 26; Luke iv. 25—27).

(2.) The gospel is *of* Christ. He is its subject.

This is more especially the meaning of the writer: that Christ is the essence, the fulness, the sum of the gospel. There is a likeness between Jesus and Paul as to the proclamation of the gospel; they were both its heralds; but as to the position occupied by them in the gospel, they infinitely differ. Paul made the gospel known; Christ was, in effect, the gospel itself. Take Paul away, and the gospel remains; take Christ away, and the gospel is gone. In the former case, a pillar is removed that adorned, a lamp is put out which lighted the temple of mercy; in the latter, the altar of sacrifice becomes a ruin, and the Shekinah glory of the Divine Spirit has vanished—the temple dwindles into an ordinary building, becomes, at best, a mere school of moral philosophy. The sublime truths which have their basis in the life, the death, the resurrection, the ascension, the intercession, and the reign of the Redeemer, constitute "the glorious gospel of Christ. In one word, the gospel is the divine treasury, and "the unsearchable riches of Christ" are its store.

2. *The design of the gospel.* "The gospel of Christ—*the power of God unto salvation.*"

"The gospel of Christ" is "*the power of God;*" that is, it is the instrument of his power: so the moon is the instrument of that attribute in producing the tides. "The gospel of Christ" "is the power of God *unto salvation.*" That power is variously exerted; sometimes for purposes of righteous vengeance, at others, for deeds of simple goodness. In the gospel it is exercised for the most gracious end. "The gospel of Christ" "is the power of God unto 'man's' salvation," with respect to,

(1.) His state.

His condition is that of a lost and perishing sinner. The sentence of condemnation is pronounced against him; he has guilt in his conscience, and hell for his desert. "The gospel of Christ 'becomes' the power of God unto salvation," since, by the provision of a surety and substitute in the person of our Redeemer, the sentence of condemnation is reversed, or rather, the execution of it is transferred in the case of "every one that believeth." "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

(2.) His character.

Man not only needs to be rescued from the guilt and desert of sin, but also from its defilement and sway. He is, at once, traitor, leper, and slave. To be saved, his black treason must be blotted out, the foul stains of his leprosy must be washed away in the Jordan of grace, and the vile fetters of his bondage must be struck off by an arm almighty. Of these blessed results "the gospel

of Christ" is instrumental, and is thus seen to be "the power of God unto salvation."

We proceed to notice,

II. THE SUITABLENESS OF THE GOSPEL TO ACCOMPLISH THE END ASCRIBED TO IT.

"The gospel of Christ" is "the power of God unto salvation," because it,

1. *Expresses the fulness of God's love.*

"God is love," is the motto and the sum of all its truths. That love is manifested in the dignity of the Saviour given; "For God so loved the world, that he gave his *only begotten Son*, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life"—in the worth of the ransom paid; "Ye were redeemed" "with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot"—in the deliverance from sin and hell which it brings—and in the "eternal life" which it bestows. As in the ladder of Jacob's marvellous vision, man ascends, by the gospel, from the lowest depths of guilt and wretchedness, and climbing, stave by stave, reaches, at length, the topmost round, where his redeemed spirit exults with "joy unspeakable" in the "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

The influence of these welcome truths is *saving*. They melt, refine, transform the man, when, in faith, he embraces them.

"Law and terrors do but harden,
All the while they work alone;
But a sense of blood-bought pardon
Soon dissolves a heart of stone."

The suitableness of "the gospel of Christ" to save is evident, since,

2. *It humbles the pride of man's reason.*

That pride must be abased if man is to be saved. The gospel tramples on his pride in the fact that he is not consulted respecting the method of his salvation; "For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" The way fixed on by God had been the last to approve itself to the depraved reason of man. "Christ crucified," is "foolishness" to him. As much foolishness as the act of Gideon, when about to encounter a mighty host, in sending away his tens of thousands of troops, and retaining his singularly equipped band of three hundred men, would have appeared in the estimation of a mere soldier. And yet, in each case, it was the divinely appointed means of working out a "great salvation."

The pride of man is humbled by the divine sovereignty. That is an important element of the gospel. A specimen of the manner in which revelation speaks of that divine perfection is found in another part of this epistle; "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." The truth thus recorded is offensive to the haughtiness of the human heart. The gospel is admirably adapted to eradicate it; for, under its salutary influence, man is brought to feel that he is a lost and guilty sinner, and must be indebted to rich and distinguishing grace alone for deliverance. He swims with the spring-tide of sovereign mercy, and gains the shores of salvation.

"The gospel of Christ" is fitted to be "the power of God unto salvation," because,

3. *It disowns the merit of human righteousness, and the saving efficacy of ritual observances.*

Men are prone to self-righteousness. They are mournfully apt to rely on their own works, their rectitude, chastity, sobriety, and benevolence, for acceptance with God. Others, fain to work out a righteousness of their own from something in the gospel itself, turn to the sacraments, as they are called, to accomplish the act. The Papist adds five to their number, and thus makes a ladder of *seven* staves by which to reach the skies. Poor dupe, it is even then far too short to answer his end! The Protestant Pharisee contents himself

with the evangelical number of *two*. Alas, how miserably do they all mistake! They would change shadows into substances, liquids into solids: and perhaps, in some sort, they do effect the latter deed; since, with the chilling touch of their formality, they freeze ordinances into icicles!

From all these self-righteous methods of winning salvation, men must be withdrawn. "The gospel of Christ" effectually does this. It teaches the sinner that "all his righteousnesses are as filthy rags;" that he, and all the race, have "become guilty before God;" that Christ is "the Lord our Righteousness;" and that only as he, the naked one, is "clothed with the garments of salvation," and "covered with the robe" of a Saviour's "righteousness," can he find access at "the throne of grace," and entrance into the realms of glory.

Again, "the gospel of Christ" "is the power of God unto salvation," inasmuch as,

4. *It is received by the simplest means.* It is "the power of God unto salvation to *every one that believeth*."

The gospel itself is distinguished by surpassing grandeur; but the means by which its blessings are obtained are marked by a beautiful simplicity. And it is thus in other departments of divine operation. What orb is more glorious than the sun? and what act is more simple than that of receiving its light? Faith, as set forth in Holy Scripture, combines belief and reliance. It *looks* to the cross, and *leans* upon it.

"Jesus it owns as King,
And all-atoning Priest;
It claims no merit of its own,
But looks for all in Christ."

Human methods of salvation are circuitous and cumbrous. Mighty efforts are made, and end in nothing. A Babel is built to crumble into a ruin: faith flies to the Refuge, and finds shelter.

Finally, "the gospel of Christ" is "the power of God unto salvation," since,

5. *It is accompanied with the energy of the Holy Spirit.*

"The gospel of Christ," however fitted to save, would not be "the power of God unto salvation" without that enegery. Nor let it be objected, "If this be the case, why attempt to prove the suitableness of the gospel to save?" God always chooses fitting instruments to accomplish his designs, and so manifests his wisdom. Nor does the suitableness of the instrument lessen the efficiency and glory of the agent. The law of gravitation is instrumental in keeping our earth in its orbit: the rain is fitted to nourish fruitfulness; but let divine activity be withdrawn, and the sun would cease to attract, and the rain to fertilise. So "the gospel of Christ" is admirably adapted to save; but it is only "through the Eternal Spirit" that it actually becomes "the power of God unto salvation." He opens the eyes of the sinner to behold the Redeemer, and, "with cords of a man, with bands of love," draws the distant one to Him who is "mighty to save."

We may learn from this subject,

1. *The glorious completeness and certainty of salvation.*

"The gospel of Christ" is "*the power of God unto salvation.*" It makes all necessary provision to effect that end: and which, in every case where it is divinely sought, will be divinely accomplished. The wonder-working rod of Moses entirely divided the waters of the Red Sea; the wand of the gospel, in the grasp of the Spirit, will assuredly cleave a safe pathway through the deeper and more dismal sea of human guilt.

2. *To adhere to the gospel in its divine simplicity.*

We live in a day distinguished by the denial, the corruption, or the concealment of the gospel. Many a one, having in his ministry or writings, deprived it of life, is evidently growing weary of it, and is fain to cry, Let me "bury my

dead out of my sight." And let him bury it; for why should the corpse be embalmed into a mummy? A *living* gospel for us, in which the prime truths of ransoming love shall occupy the conspicuous place which their gracious Author has assigned them!

3. *Look forward to the future with hopefulness.*

You have to labour, my Christian brethren, in a hard world. Difficulties and opposition meet you at every turn. Nevertheless, "thank God, and take courage;" for "the gospel of Christ" will yet, to a large extent, be "the power of God unto salvation." When, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts," is your chosen watchword, then "Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the head-stone with shoutings, Grace, grace unto it!" may well be your bold challenge.

Let me earnestly press on you the claims of the "Baptist Evangelical Society." It is striving to effect a great work, and the blessing of God is crowning its labours to make known "the gospel of grace" in some parts of the continent of Europe with growing success. Support this society, then, with your more fervent prayers, and your more liberal contributions.

4. *That "the gospel of Christ" has a limit.*

It is "the power of God unto salvation to *every one that believeth*." There is complete deliverance up to this point; but not beyond it. No salvation without faith. As soon might you expect the breeze to waft the vessel when its sails are not spread, as to hope for salvation without trust in the Saviour. To each one of you, my hearers, I put the important question once asked by our Lord, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" "Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."

MOHAMMEDANISM, PAST AND FUTURE.

THE newspapers state that "Mussulmans are greatly agitated by a prediction that the present year, 1864, is to behold the overthrow of the infidels." WE Christians, who are infidels in their esteem, have predictions also which relate to Mohammedan powers. These predictions do not name 1864, but seem to speak of years *soon* to come, as years which will bring, not triumph, but overthrow, to those powers. The general agitation existing among Mohammedans, and the expulsion by Russia of the Circassians (who are Mohammedans) from the Caucasian mountains, to seek a refuge in Asia Minor, are events already recorded among those which give importance to this the 1242 year from A.D. 622, which was the first year of the Mohammedan era.

MOHAMMED was an Arabian. The Arabs have dwelt in Arabia from the earliest times. Their historians say that their existing races are descended from two stocks; from Kahtan, the Joktan of Scripture (Gen. x. 25), and from Ishmael, son of Abraham. The Arabians have not been much intermixed with other nations, and have never been wholly subdued. The family of Mohammed claimed a direct descent from Ishmael. At the time when Mohammed was born, most of the Arabians were idolators. There were very many Jews then living in Arabia. And many Arabs were called Christians; but the Christianity of that age in Arabia was extremely corrupt. Among their objects of worship was the Virgin Mary. The nations of the east, as well as of the west, "received not the love of the truth," and therefore God sent them "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." (2 Thes. ii. 2.)

MOHAMMED, for some years before A.D. 622, had declared himself a prophet; had called on his countrymen to turn from idols, and to worship Allah, the Supreme, as the *only* God. In that year he fled from Mecca, where his life was threatened, to Yatreb, afterwards called Medina. The people of Yatreb received him as their king, and offered to *compel* others to submit to him. The sword was drawn, and from that time war was waged till the tribes of all

Arabia, and till the adjacent countries, declared that there is no God but Allah, and that Mohammed is his prophet.

"The castles and towns of the unwarlike JEWS were rapidly taken and plundered, and the unhappy people, being unwilling to embrace the religion of the conqueror, were driven out, or persecuted and slaughtered with the utmost cruelty." The Christians were at first treated leniently, but afterwards this mode of treatment was wholly changed.

Mohammed died in 632. His Arab followers were often called Saracens, from the name of the most noted people among them. After his death they extended their conquests on all sides. They destroyed the Persian monarchy, after it had been restored and had continued in its revived glory for more than 400 years. They wrested Palestine, Syria, and Egypt from the Romans. Jerusalem was taken in the year 636. Mr. Mede said "No nation had ever so wide a command, nor ever were so many kingdoms, so many regions, subjugated in so short a space of time. . . . In the space of eighty, or not many more years, they subdued and acquired for the diabolical kingdom of Mohammed, Palestine, Syria, both Armenias, almost all Asia Minor, Persia, India, Egypt, Numedia, all Barbary, even to the river Niger, Portugal, Spain, a great part of Italy; also Sicily, Candia, Cyprus, and the other islands of the Mediterranean Sea." (Bp. Newton—Proph. p. 545.)

The TURKS, a valiant and fierce race, who came from beyond the Caspian Sea, received the religion of Mohammed; but the dissensions of the two nations, Turks and Saracens, "were never more violent than from the time that Mohammed became their common chief in matters of religion." In the tenth century, the Turks fell upon the Saracens. They deprived them by degrees of their dominions, and established their own empire on the ruin of theirs. (Mosheim, Chap. x. Pt. I.)

The last three chapters of the prophet DANIEL revealed what was to "befal HIS PEOPLE in the latter days." (Dan. x. 14.) He was told of other kings of Persia, who were to reign (xi. 2); of the kingdom of Alexander the Great, and of the four kingdoms into which it was to be divided (xi. 4—29); of the dominion which the Romans—Chittim should exercise over Palestine and the surrounding countries; first, as a heathen power, defiling the temple (Dan. xi. 31), taking away the daily sacrifice, and setting up the abomination which maketh desolate (Matt. xxiv. 15); and then afterwards (see Dan. xi. 36—39) as a power which would *corrupt* the true worship of God by the institution of worship and service of its own. (See Wintle on Daniel: Bp. Newton—Proph. chap. xvii.)

Respecting the king who was to do "according to his will," Bishop Newton says—"This power began in the ROMAN EMPERORS, who summoned councils, and directed and influenced their determinations almost as they pleased. After the division of the empire, this power STILL INCREASED, and was exerted principally by the Greek emperors in the east and by the bishops of Rome in the west." (Proph. p. 340.)

Daniel was informed, with respect to this power, that "at the time of the end, a king of the south shall push at him;" that is, says Bishop Newton, "THE SARACENS, who were of the Arabians, and came from the south; and who, under the conduct of their false prophet, Mohammed, and his successors, made war upon the Emperor Heraclius; and, with amazing rapidity, deprived him of Egypt, Syria, and many of his finest provinces." The prophet was further told, as to this power—"And the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships;" that is, says Bishop Newton, "THE TURKS, who were originally of the Scythians, and came from the north; and, after the Saracens, seized on Syria, and assembled with great violence the remains of the Greek empire, and in time rendered themselves absolute masters of the whole. The Saracens weakened the Greek (the Eastern Roman) empire, but the Turks totally ruined and destroyed it." (Proph. p. 351.)

Bishop Newton thought that verses 44 and 45 of chapter xi., "But rumours shall disturb him from the east and from the north," &c., were still unfulfilled when he wrote in 1754. So also did Mede, and Wintle. Bishop Newton said (and this was a hundred years ago) "THE PERSIANS are seated to the east of the Othman dominions, and THE RUSSIANS to the north." "The power of Russia is growing daily, and it is a current tradition among the common people in Turkey, that their empire shall one time or other be destroyed by the Russians." On the other hand, he remarked that the Christians of Turkey, who are members of the same Greek Church as the Russians, "have an esteem and affection for the Muscovites, as for those whom ancient prophecies mention to be designed by God for their avengers and deliverers in after ages." (Proph. p. 359.)

The recent expulsion of the Circassians from Mount Caucasus will bring the Russian and Persian empires much nearer together. "The Porte is at all times jealous of the junction of the two powers of Persia and Russia, and exerts all its policy to prevent it." (Proph. p. 359.)

"Whatever be the motive and occasion, the TURKS 'shall go forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many.' The original word which we translate 'utterly to make away,' signifies 'to anathematise, to consecrate, to devote to utter perdition,' so that it strongly implies that this war would be made upon a RELIGIOUS ACCOUNT." (Proph. p. 359.)

"And he shall plant the tabernacles of his camp between the seas in the glorious holy mountain." "This," said Bishop Newton, "must denote some part of the Holy Land. There the Turk shall encamp with all his power, 'yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him,'—shall help him effectually and deliver him." (Proph. p. 360.)

After the destruction of the king of the north—that is of the Turks, there is to be "a time of trouble such as never WAS SINCE THERE WAS A NATION, EVEN TO THAT SAME TIME," and Daniel was told that "at that time THY PEOPLE shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." (Dan. xii. 1.)

This enquiry was made, "HOW LONG SHALL BE THE END OF THESE WONDERS?" Bishop Newton, viewing this enquiry side by side with what is said in Daniel xi. 40, of the times of the Saracens and Turks as "the time of the end," regards it as asking how long the dominion of these powers should continue. "The answer is returned in the most solemn manner (Dan. xii. 7) that it 'shall be for a time, times, and a half.' A time, times, and a half, are three prophetic years and a half [of 360 days each]; and three prophetic years and a half, are 1260 prophetic days; and 1260 prophetic days, are 1260 years. The SAME TIME therefore is fixed for the desolation and oppression of the eastern church, as for the tyranny of the little horn [Popery] by Daniel vii. 25, in the western church; and it is WONDERFULLY REMARKABLE that the doctrine of Mohammed was first forged at Mecca, and the supremacy of the Pope established by virtue of a grant from the wicked tyrant Phocas, IN THE SAME YEAR OF CHRIST, 606." In that "very year Mohammed retired to his cave to forge that imposture there, which two years after, A.D. 608, he began to propagate at Mecca." (Proph. pp. 361, 362.)

The angel said also to Daniel (xii. 7), "and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power," or, as Wintle renders it, "after the accomplishment of the dispersions of the HOLY PEOPLE, all these things shall be finished," which Bishop Newton understands to mean, that "when THE JEWS SHALL BE RECALLED FROM THEIR DISPERSION, then all these things shall receive their full and final completion." (Proph. p. 362.)

There was still another question put as to THE TIME of these things. "The prophet, not sufficiently understanding the [former] answer, enquired (xii. 8), 'What,' or 'how long, shall be these latter times,' or 'latter wonders?' And it is answered again (xii. 11), that 'from the time of taking away the daily sacrifice, and setting up the abomination that maketh desolate, there shall be 1280 days.' The days still are prophetic days or years." The Bishop remarks

that "'The setting up of the abomination of desolation,' appears to be a general phrase, and comprehensive of various events; that "it is applied by our Saviour (Matt. xxiv. 15) to the destruction of the city and temple by the Romans, under the conduct of Titus, in the reign of Vespasian;" and that he thinks that it refers here "to the Mohammedans invading and desolating Christendom." He adds that "If this interpretation be true, the religion of Mohammed will prevail in the east the space of 1260 years, and then a great and glorious revolution will follow." "But another still greater and more glorious will succeed" at the end of 1290 years; and another at the end of 1335 years." (Proph. p. 363.) The prophecy relates to Daniel's OWN PEOPLE, so that the powers referred to are, we may suppose, to be regarded chiefly as they affect the Jews and their own land.

The remarkable number of 1260 days is named four times in the book of Revelation (xi. 3; xii. 6, 14; xiii. 5), as well as twice in Daniel. From comparing these six places, it appears that the prophetic year consisted of twelve months, of thirty days each. Mr. Robert Fleming, writing in 1701, drew from this circumstance the conclusion, that eighteen years must be deducted from these 1260 prophetic years, in order to have that number of years of our own era, each consisting of 365¼ days, which corresponds to those 1260 prophetic years in actual length of time; that number of our years is 1242.

From this reckoning, Mr. Fleming conjectured, a whole century beforehand, that the judgments denoted by the fifth vial, which was to be poured out on the seat of the beast—"the dominions that more immediately belong to and depend upon the Roman see"—would "probably begin about the year 1794, and expire about 1848;" but that their effect would be "to exceedingly weaken, not totally destroy the Papacy. (Apoc. Key, p. 59.) The year 1848 was fixed on by him, because this date was the result of adding 1242 years to 606, the year when "the Pope received the title of Supreme Bishop." Events have, in a remarkable manner, justified this conjecture.

By adopting the same number of 1242 years, as equivalent to the 1260 prophetic years which in Daniel (xii. 7) measure the continuance of Mohammedan rule in Palestine, we arrive at the year 1878 as likely to be the year which witnesses its overthrow there. The Saracens are said to have taken Jerusalem in 636, which number, added to 1242, makes 1878. And if we may suppose that the like number of 1242 years, when added to the date at which the Mohammedan conquests BEGAN, A.D. 622, will probably give us a time when signs of the approaching end of the Mohammedan rule will be very manifest, then we have THIS PRESENT YEAR, 1864 (that is 622 and 1242), as a year likely to witness GREAT CHANGES IN MOHAMMEDAN NATIONS.

WILLIAM NORTON.

Page for the Young.

GRANDMA'S FORTUNE-TELLING.

"Now what mischief?" said grandma, smiling, as she entered the room and found the children huddled together by the bookcase, evidently trying to cover up what they were about.

"Lizzie's telling fortunes!" said little black-eyed Nell, looking up brightly.

"Ah! that's it, is it?" said grandma, taking out the big knitting-pegs and a huge soft ball of crimson wool, which seemed to grow fast, under her fingers, into a warm gay tippet for some of the little folks. "Well, come and sit around the fire, and let grandma tell fortunes for you. She's a master hand at it."

"Why, grandma," said the children, coming forward, "we were afraid you would think it was not right!"

"Well, I do not approve of common fortune-telling, but my kind will do no harm. It does not require a tea-cup,

nor do I need to look into your hands. Still, I saw the directions in print once. To begin with Lizzie: If a little girl with blue eyes, auburn hair, a quick mind, and nimble little feet and fingers, will use her eyes and mind well in getting a good education, and employ her feet and fingers in useful work, such as helping mother about the house, and taking plenty of exercise out of doors with little brothers and sisters; if she keeps her rosy lips from ever pouting, and strives to love and obey God every day, she will be very likely to have a long, healthful life, to make a great many people happy by it, to be good-looking in everybody's eyes, and beloved and respected everywhere as a sensible, excellent woman. Now could anybody make out a better fortune than that for my little grand-daughter? Every word of it true, too; while most fortune-telling is only falsehoods put together."

"Now, Georgie, if a boy with black hair and eyes will learn to master his temper well, so that ever so great provocation cannot make him angry, he will gain a greater victory than General Grant did at Vicksburg even. If he will study his books hard, and learn to be very accommodating at home when he is asked to do anything, everybody will look on him as a sensible boy, and love him for his obliging ways. It is the polite, civil people who make their way best in the world. Try, and see if you do not find it so."

"Now, if a little black-eyed four-year old, like Nelly here, will run to grandma's room and bring me the black silk work-bag which hangs on the chair-back, I should not wonder if she, or her grandmother, could find enough almonds and strawberry candy in it to treat all this little company."

Very merry were the children over grandma's fortune-telling, and little Nelly insisted that hers was best of all.

It had this peculiarity, that it applied just as well to children whose eyes and hair were of any other colour. So you can apply it, dear children, if you will, and I know you will find it come true.

A WORD IN SEASON.

EMMA C., an earnest young Christian, had returned from school, where much religious interest existed, to her country home to spend a summer vacation. It was a sultry Sabbath in August, and the long dusty walk to church was very wearisome.

Toiling up the hill before her, she saw Mrs. D., a young woman about her own age, who was far more weary than herself—weary of her life of toil and hardship, weary of her cares and trials, but above all, weary of her own sinful heart—weary without any hope or prospect of rest in this life, or that which is to come. Arrived at the small church, they found it closed. It was the pastor's summer vacation, and no supply had been obtained. Numbers turned away, sadly to pursue their walk homeward under the rays of the fierce noontide sun, and Emma, as she turned, caught a glimpse of Mrs. D.'s sad, careworn face, and thought she detected more than ordinary regret at the disappointment. In an instant she was by her side. Their way home was the same, and Emma resolved that Mrs. D. should not return without a friendly invitation to come to Jesus.

To her surprise she found her more than willing—anxious to learn the way of life. Earnestly Emma pointed her to "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." As they parted she said, "Now, my dear Mrs. D., go to your room, and leave it not until you have resolved to cast your soul upon Jesus; and I will spend this Sabbath in prayer that you may be accepted."

When they next met, this was the language of Mrs. D.'s heart:—

"I came to Jesus as I was,
Weary, and worn, and sad;
I found in him a resting-place,
And he has made me glad."

And her subsequent life proved the reality of the change. She gave herself no rest until her sisters were also brought into the fold, and both Mrs. D. and those sisters are now rearing their families in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

"In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand." (Eccles. xi. 6.)

Reviews.

Memoirs of Joseph Sturge. By HENRY RICHARD. London: S. W. Partridge, 9, Paternoster-row; A. W. Bennett, 5, Bishopgate Without. Cloth, lettered. Pp. 622.

ONE of the brightest examples in modern times of "the blessed life," was the life of Joseph Sturge; and one of the best pieces of biography in modern times, is "Memoirs of Joseph Sturge," by Henry Richard. The subject was a noble one, and it is nobly treated. The memorial is worthy of the pure and sublime career that it chronicles. The biographer has evidently a deep and holy sympathy with the principles that animated the departed philanthropist; but he does not weary you with endless digressions in the shape of his own moralisings and opinions. The deceased in great measure tells the story of his own life. The facts of his history are engraven in the well known events of the last thirty years. They are inwrought into the modern history of our country. To understand the life of Josph Sturge, a man needs to be well acquainted with the recent history of England; and to understand the history of England during that period, we ought to read the life of Joseph Sturge. In the volume before us we have that life drawn by the hand of "a master in the use of the pen." It was the privilege of the reviewer to meet the great philanthropist on many occasions, and powerful was the spell exerted over him in every instance by that noble and disinterested character, that soul full of all tender sensibilities, that voice of touching pathos, and that smile of winning sweetness. To know Joseph Sturge, was to revere him, to love him, and to be moved by him. You could not resist the moral fascination! He infused into other souls his own divine affections. He carried the same elevated principles into all the departments of thought. He revered man, as man, clothed with God's image, and an heir of immortality. Hence his abhorrence of slavery, and hence his advocacy of manhood suffrage in politics. He was emphatically a man of thorough consistency. His lofty principles guided him in every walk of life. He never hesitated in following them wherever they legitimately led him. He was a genuine disciple of the Prince of Peace, and was one of the brightest examples of true Christian heroism that the world ever saw. He was the last of a glorious race of the type of Wilberforce, Clarkson, Allen, Knibb, and Burchell. Their works are their noblest monument. Posterity through all coming generations shall bless them, and eternity shall behold them shining "as the stars, for ever and for ever."

Mr. Richard, in the volume before us, traces Mr. Sturge's career, in his early years, in business and in the family, as a citizen, in his struggles for the Reform Bill of 1832, in his early anti-slavery labours, in his conduct with regard to the Emancipation Act, in his visit to the West Indies, in his care for the emancipated negroes, in his labours to form a new Anti-Slavery Society, in his visit to America, in his influence in appeasing the Birmingham riots, in his labours for Free Trade, in his advocacy of manhood suffrage, in his collision with the Evangelical Alliance over their compromise on the Slavery question, in his various and repeated labours in the cause of Peace, in his domestic virtues, in his last efforts to do good, and in his peaceful but sudden death.

The theme is a glorious one for all magnanimous souls, and we thank Mr. Richard for the manner in which he has presented it before the public. Every one should read this book. It is worth a cart-load of the sensational works that now teem from the press. It is more interesting than any romance, and cannot fail to exert a bracing influence upon the best principles of the renewed heart. It will tend to develop a true moral manhood, It should be in every Sunday school library in the kingdom. Our young

men should read it; so should our ministers, our men of business, our merchants, and our statesmen. It is emphatically a book for the age. We hope to present our readers with occasional gleanings from its precious pages.

The Righteousness of Christ, the Righteousness of God; a Refutation of the Views generally held by the Christians commonly called "Plymouth Brethren" on that subject. By R. GOVETT. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster-row, E.C. Pp. 197.

THIS book is a most thorough and searching examination of the errors of the "Plymouth Brethren" touching the sinner's justification before God. It is written with much good temper, and displays considerable controversial power. We have read it, every word, with great care and attention, and are thoroughly with the author in the main positions which he takes up. In short, we have here an able vindication of the vital doctrine of the sinner's free justification, by the imputed righteousness of Christ, through faith. The *first* part proves, we think, satisfactorily, that the righteousness of God by which a sinner is meritoriously justified is the righteousness of the Saviour. The *second*, shows that justification is strictly a judicial act. The *third* part is devoted to the imputation of the righteousness that justifies; and there is a short *fourth* and concluding section on the types. Throughout, Mr. Govett most acutely traces the errors of "The Brethren" to their ultimate issues and unmasks the serious defects of their theory of justification. We give the following as a sample of his method and style.

"This righteousness is 'upon all that believe.' It is something separate from God's character, and capable of being laid on the sons of men. It is a sum of obedience reckoned to each believer. It is actually and savingly the clothing of the man of faith, at once *his* robe, and the robe of *God*." To the unbeliever it is a garment laid on the table before him. To the believer it is a garment already covering his shoulders."—P. 26. "How simple and beautiful the truth! Justification is the meeting of the righteousness of the subject with the righteousness of the Ruler. The righteousness of the Ruler alone would condemn us; but when it finds us clothed with the perfect obedience of the subject which was wrought for us by Christ, it saves us. Righteous are we, and God can properly pronounce us righteous in law."—P. 37.

On some minor points we differ most decidedly from the author. He says that "Righteousness is right conduct, not an inwardly holy and perfect state. Law demands obedience; it deals with *acts*. Adam was condemned, not for his wrong state of soul, but for his *act* against law."—P. 119. The same principles are embodied in the illustration in pp. 122, 123, 124, and give a very defective view of the scope and extent of God's law, whether of Eden or Sinai; for, "The law is spiritual." Its concluding and defining precept is, "Thou shalt not *covet*." Christ sums it up in a right state of heart, "Thou shalt *love*." It must take cognisance of the thoughts and affections which are the movements of the soul, the noblest part of man. God will not be satisfied with mere external obedience.

This fallacy, just pointed out, leads the author to lay an undue stress on the difference between *innocence* and *righteousness* as applied to man's accountability to God. The man who is perfectly innocent of any breach of God's law must be positively righteous, for the simple reason that the law requires *positive* righteousness, both internal and external. If he failed to produce this active obedience, he could not be innocent in the eye of God's law. With man's law it is different, for that only takes cognisance of outward acts; but God's law is spiritual, and is aimed at the heart as well as at the external life. Hence, to strain the analogy between the operation of human laws and the administration of the Ruler of human *souls*, is sure to lead to inaccuracy of thought.

Nor do we believe with Mr. Govett that *conscience* is the result of the fall, or that Adam "obtained his

conscience" through disobedience to the law, p. 148; or that "out of the transgression of our first parent sprang conscience, which may improperly be called a law."—Pp. 165-189. Conscience is a faculty indigenous in man as a rational being, and, in fact, common to all intelligent agents. Sin is the parent of guilt in the conscience, but not of conscience as a faculty.

From the ultra millenarian interpretation of many passages, too, we most thoroughly dissent. Christ *has* come as the antitype of Adam, and is now enthroned. All believers shall partake in *all* the results of the righteousness of the second Adam. "Reigning in life" is not to be understood of a *millenial* reign upon earth. Grace does reign *now* in the person of the crowned Mediator. The invitation in the parable of "the wedding garment" is not to a kingdom of *millenial* glory.

But we forbear to multiply these adverse criticisms upon minor details of interpretation. The author, however, must permit us to express a hope that in any second edition of this truly valuable and much needed work, he will give us an index and full table of contents. In this edition there is not a scrap of the kind. There are besides, some obscurities, misprints, and needless repititions which should be removed.

We hope our readers will get the book and read it. It will make them think, and will enlarge their views on many vital points. We shall be glad to meet the respected author again as a contributor to our theological literature.

What saith the Scripture concerning the Kingdom and Advent of Christ? By W. P. LYON, B.A. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster-row. 224 pages.

No work since the publication of "Short Arguments about the Millenium, &c.," by Mr. B. C. Young, of the Darkhouse, Coseley, can compare with the present one on the subject of the Millenarian Controversy. It is both clear and candid, and the author has proved himself to be a thorough master of his subject. He has examined every main position with an admirable fidelity and discrimination, and has thus supplied a work which we strongly recommend to all our readers. The following quotation exhibits both the author's style and his general mode of managing the argument.

"He (Christ) could not come to *receive* the kingdom, seeing he already possesses it. Nor could he come to *commence* his reign over it, seeing that reign is already begun. He could receive no accession of *power* by coming to earth, for he already possesses '*all* power.' His coming is not necessary for the destruction of his enemies. This can be effected as hitherto, by the movements of his Providence. Nor is it necessary to the predicted conversion of the nations. This is the work of his Spirit. For what purpose, then, unless for that predicted in the Word of God, and specified above, should he come again to earth? If He now reigns over our world on his *heavenly* throne, why should he come to reign over it on an *earthly* throne? If his faithful people, wherever they are scattered, may now enjoy equally the presence of their King, why should a time ever arrive when he will be nearer to some of them than to others, and when a privileged few will have an access to him from which the vast majority will be excluded? But this would be the unavoidable result of Christ's coming to reign personally, and on a local throne, in our world. Those of his people immediately around him might then indeed 'see the King in his beauty,' but others of them would have to travel for this purpose to 'the land that is very far off.' The days of pilgrimages would be restored. Then the Christian would no longer be found working quietly in his allotted sphere, seeking to manifest his love to Christ by 'keeping his commandments,' that Christ might 'come unto him and make his abode with him.' He must go to Jerusalem to make his abode with Christ."—P. 40.

In an appendix of nearly 40 pages, the author gives an interesting correspondence with Dr. Cumming on some leading points in the discussion. The Dr. does not appear to any great advantage in this encounter, for Mr.

Lyon has much the best of the argument.

Jesus Christ's Bible.
The Snare of the Hour.
English Monthly Tract Society.
Two admirable tracts, the former intended to meet the cavils of Colenso by the authority of Christ; and the other adapted to counteract the opposite tendency in the direction of Popery. Both deserve a wide circulation.

A Temperance Lecture. By J. LIVESEY. One Penny. London: W. Tweedie, 337, Strand. Pp. 32.
ONE of the best defences of the teetotal side in in the Temperance controversy that we have ever read.

The British Millenial Harbinger. London: Hall and Co.
THE organ of the brethren holding the views of Alexander Campbell, but open to free discussion.

The Gardener's Weekly Magazine. London: E. W. Allen, Warwick-lane.
THIS is an admirable helper to all growers of fruits, vegetables, and flowers. Brethren who are fortunate enough to have a *glebe* will find it very serviceable.

The Little Gleaner. One Penny. London: Houlston and Wright.
A GOOD monthly for little folks.

The Sower. London: Houlston and Wright.
A NICE halfpenny magazine.

Mr. Cobden and The Times.
Cobden-Delane Controversy.
Primogeniture and Entail.
Non-Intervention in the Danish War.
Manchester: Alexander Ireland and Co., Pall Mall Court.
THESE are all publications which deserve the serious attention of every right-minded Englishman.

A Concise View of Christian Baptism. By JOHN CRAPS. Pp. 16. One Penny, or 8s. per hundred. London: Elliot Stock, Paternoster-row.
BY far the most exhaustive and convincing penny tract on Baptism ever written. We know of nothing that has yet equalled it. It should be circulated by tens of thousands.

Intelligence.

DENMARK.

Copenhagen, June 7th, 1864.

Mr. J. C. Woollacott.

My dear Brother,—Owing to the unhappy war in which we are engaged, and the impossibility, in consequence thereof, of getting letters away, the post and other communication with other places having been stopped, it is some time since I wrote to you. I sent you indeed a report of my labours some time ago, by a round about way, but whether you had received it or not, I do not know, as I have not heard from you or any of our friends for a very, very long time. At the end of May I received a letter from Mr. Thomas Dawson Walker, secretary of the Salendine Nook Juvenile Missionary Society. It was dated 14th April. This is the only one I have received from any of our friends. Perhaps you and others may have written, but no letter has reached me.

War is an awful thing. I have seen much of its destructive and ruining character of late. It makes one shudder to think of the many thousands of immortal souls who have been hurried into eternity to appear before the righteous Judge, most of them, no doubt, unprepared. What cause there is for all God's people earnestly to pray that the time may soon come when the people shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks—when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and when they shall not learn war any more. But, though God permits war, and employs such means to chastise the nations for their sin and ungodliness, yet his chastisements in

these respects are also tempered with mercy. When we consider how sin abounds amidst the greatest and most blessed privileges, in the face of gospel light and gospel mercies, it is a marvel that the Lord does not make bare his arm to strike harder. But His mercy endureth for ever. Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. Though we may lament all the misery occasioned already by this unhappy war—and who knows where and when it may end—yet we are fully persuaded that it shall be productive to the promotion of the kingdom and glory of God. A door for usefulness has been opened, an opportunity afforded the people of God to labour and do good, and their energies have been put into operation, which all, but for this war, most likely, would not have been the case; and much good, I doubt not, is done. Thus God is able to bring good out of that which in itself is an evil. Several of our brethren have laboured in the army among our soldiers, both in Slesvig, Als, and Dybböl, and distributed a vast number of tracts, New Testaments, and Bibles. They have also visited the wounded and sick in the hospitals, and the prisoners of war. I myself have laboured among the Prussians, Austrians, Hungarians, &c., besides our own soldiers. In Veile I visited the wounded and sick soldiers of the allied armies, and supplied them with tracts of various languages, and the "Four Gospels" and the "Epistle to the Romans," in German, bound up separately. You will be glad to hear that these messengers of mercy were received with gratitude. How many tracts and Holy Scriptures we have distributed, I cannot say exactly, but I do not think it is too much when I say that we here in Denmark alone have distributed very nearly 50,000 tracts already, and ere long I dare say the number will increase to about 100,000. Of Bibles and New Testaments I cannot give you any exact number. One brother alone has since the beginning of April disposed of 360 Bibles and Testaments.

In this good work we have been greatly assisted by the Religious Tract Society in London. Just before the war commenced I received a grant of £20 for tracts. Our kind brother, Mr. Norton, also once sent me £10 for tracts. Without this kind aid we should not have been able to do anything approaching to this. Is it to be supposed that all these labours in the Lord should be in vain? and that the many earnest prayers which have ascended to God should be unanswered? Surely, to suppose this for one moment would be the height of unbelief.

From the above you may conclude that, beside other labours, I have been very industrious in translating and publishing religious tracts, particularly when I inform you that I have no one to assist me in this kind of work.

Until the 27th May I laboured in the south of Jutland, preaching the gospel in many places and various parishes. Most of the meetings have of late been exceedingly well attended. There is a great desire in many to hear the gospel, deep impressions are made, and many seem to be under conviction. We often see tears of penitence flow in our meetings. Thus, notwithstanding all our troubles, we have reason to believe that the Lord is carrying on a good and gracious work in this country, and I am also happy to say that most of our churches do pretty well. However, it appears that when the good seed is sown, and there begins to be a little more than the ordinary shaking among the dry bones, the enemy takes alarm, he is roused to activity, and sows tares amongst the wheat. So it is here now, I am sorry to say. For a considerable time we have not, apparently at least, been troubled much from that quarter. But the enemy of souls works in secret. He is awake, and labours while the men sleep, and it is when the tares appear that some first get their eyes opened and see that he has been there, although they may have been warned beforehand of his secret workings. Some time ago the question about Open Communion was raised. After a little while but very little was heard about it. It will, however, no doubt, come again. Then some belonging to the churches

founded in Sweden visited us, and these, as far as I have been able to ascertain, instead of preaching the gospel, and justification of God's free and sovereign grace, through faith in the Lord Jesus, preach the law, and works, and justification by works, and, in connection with this, sinless perfection, or perfect, unspotted holiness, in the creature himself here on earth. It appears they will deny it. They have already found an entrance here, and it is not so remarkable, since they have every appearance of humility and sanctity. I fear this will cause us much trouble.

May 27th, I left Jutland for Copenhagen. The church here is doing pretty well. The meetings are well attended, and much attention is paid to the Word proclaimed. If the war should commence again, which, however, I do not hope, I shall have to leave before the 12th instant.

Last night (Monday, 6th), we had our usual missionary prayer meeting. A brother told us that he had visited the wounded soldiers the day previous (Lord's-day), distributing tracts, and speaking to them of their souls. A soldier came and told him that he had got a ball right through his chest, pointing to the place. Our brother reminded him of the danger in which he had been, and spoke to him about eternity, righteousness, and judgment. While speaking to him, another man, who appeared not to have many days more here on earth, was lying in his bed and listening to what was said, and, being overpowered by his feelings, he began to weep. Our brother turned to him and spoke to him about the dear Saviour, who came into the world to save sinners, and the poor dying man listened with deep emotion. He wished to have a New Testament, but being unable to put out his hand and take a purse which he had in a pocket on his chest, one of his comrades took it and paid for the Testament. Thus, through the grace of God, a soul may be saved in the eleventh hour.

I must now draw this long letter to a conclusion. On the 27th May, when I left Jutland, I posted a letter to you at Veile. I hope you have received it. I have been waiting every day to hear from you.

With affectionate regards to yourself, Mrs. Woollacott and family, and all kind friends, and wishing you every blessing,

I am, dear Brother,
Yours in the love of Christ,
A. P. FÖRSTER.

[Mr. Förster, on a slip of paper put into the outer envelope at the last moment, says, "I am all at once become severely ill with the ague, or fever, and am now lying in bed suffering great pain. Pray for me."]

ASSOCIATIONS.

YORKSHIRE BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.

THIS association, comprising seventy churches, held its annual meetings at Port Mahon Chapel, Sheffield, on Tuesday, May 17th, 1864, and two following days. At four p.m. on Tuesday, after singing and prayer, the Rev. J. P. Campbell, the minister of the place, was chosen moderator, and the following committees were appointed:—The General Business, The Civil Questions, The Denominational Institutions, and The Chapel Cases.

A fraternal conference was held at six p.m. The introductory paper on "The Baptist Local Preacher," &c., was read by the Rev. C. Larom, of Sheffield. It gave general satisfaction; several brethren took part in the discussion, and some valuable suggestions were made. On Wednesday, at half-past six a.m. the Rev. H. Watts, of Golcar, conducted the prayer meeting and gave a very feeling address. At ten o'clock the Rev. R. Holmes, of Rawden, preached from "Ye are the lights of the world," after which the Rev. J. Hanson, of Huddersfield, read the circular letter on "Infant Salvation," a production which should be read by Christians of all denominations. The letters from the churches and the statistics were read at two p.m., from which it appeared that 509 persons had been added to the churches by baptism, 136 by letter, and 48 by restoration; total added, 693. There had been removed by death, 137; by dismission, 253; exclusion, 65; withdrawn, 89; erasure, 53; total removed, 597; giving 96 as the clear increase. Total number of members, 8,691; 69

preaching stations; 82 schools; 2,807 teachers; and 15,265 scholars. A large number of persons (175) have been dismissed to form new and distinct churches in the county, which are not yet connected with the association, so that the *real* increase to the denomination is much greater than appears, being in fact 271. At this meeting notice was given that the church at Hallfield, Bradford, applied for admission to the association.

The annual meeting of the Itinerant Society was held at half-past six p.m., and suitable addresses were delivered by the Revs. A. Ashworth, of Bramley, and W. C. Upton, of Beverley, and Messrs. W. Stead and J. Cooke, of Bradford, Dr. Ackworth being in the chair. The early prayer meeting on Thursday was conducted by the Rev. D. Crumpton, of Salendine-nook, who gave a suitable address. At ten a.m. the Rev. A. Bowden, of Driffield, preached from the words, "the gospel of the grace of God," after which the subscribers to the Baptist Chapel Loan Society met, and a report of the state of the society was given. At two p.m. the ministers and messengers met for the transaction of business, when a long discussion ensued on the report of the sub-committee on association services, resulting in the rejection of nearly the whole of the alterations proposed. The circular-letter drawn up by the Rev. J. Hanson, of Huddersfield, was adopted and ordered to be printed.

The next autumnal meeting is to be held at Driffield, and the next annual meetings at Pellon-lane Chapel, Halifax, the Revs. D. Crumpton and C. Larom to be the preachers,

The Rev. J. P. Chown, of Bradford, was appointed to write the circular-letter; subject, "Domestic Piety," &c. The Rev. B. Evans, D.D., of Scarborough, to draw up the paper for the next fraternal conference; subject, "Pastoral Visitation."

The churches of York and Salterforth were received into the Association, and important resolutions were adopted respecting denominational institutions and some civil questions now occupying the public attention.

At seven p.m. the concluding service was held in Townhead Chapel, when the devotional exercises were conducted by the Rev. J. G. Oncken, of Hamburg. The Rev. W. Best, B.A., of Leeds, preached from Galatians, vi. 14; and the moderator concluded the services with prayer.

Sheffield being a considerable distance from many of the churches, the attendance was not so large as it sometimes is; but the sermons and addresses were very good, and, on the whole, the meetings pleasurable and edifying. A kindly spirit pervaded the whole.

NORTH-WESTERN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meetings of this association were held on Wednesday and Thursday, May 18th and 19th, in the Baptist Chapel, Millgate, a station connected with the first Baptist church, Bacup. On Wednesday afternoon, at two o'clock, the Rev. J. Smith, of Bacup, was chosen moderator, and the letters from the churches were read. These churches, fourteen in number, reported a total increase of 148, and a total decrease of 81, being a clear increase for the year of 67 members. The Rev. J. Howe then read the circular-letter he had prepared, on "The preparation and employment of lay agency." The letter was subsequently received and ordered to be circulated as the letter of the association. In the evening, at half-past six, after devotional exercises conducted by the Rev. R. Berry (Independent), of Hall-fold, the association sermon was preached by the Rev. J. Harvey, of Little Leigh, from Ezekiel xxxiv, 11, 12, and a collection made at the close, on behalf of the association fund for the assistance of poor and weak churches.

On Thursday morning, at half-past seven, a prayer meeting was held, in which several ministers and other brethren took part; and an address was delivered by the Rev. W. Gatenby, from the words, "Brethren, pray for us." At half-past ten, a public meeting was held, under the presidency of the moderator, and addresses were delivered by the Revs. J. Wilkinson, S. Sykes, and T. Dawson. In the afternoon the usual business meeting of the association was held; the moderator in the chair.

The churches at Brunswick-road,

Liverpool, and at Norley, Cheshire, were received.

The next annual meeting to be held at Waterbarn; the Rev. T. Durant to be the association preacher, and the Rev. H. Hall to write the circular-letter, on "The duty of believers to give according to their ability to the cause of Christ."

The Rev. J. Howe was thanked for his past services as secretary, and re-elected to the same office for the next three years.

The usual votes of thanks were accorded to the friends entertaining the association, and to the moderator for his conduct in the chair.

In the evening, at half-past six, after reading and prayer by the Rev. H. Hall, a sermon was preached by the Rev. E. Parker, of Farsley, from Rev. xii. 11, and the interesting services of the occasion were concluded with prayer by the Rev. J. Smith, of Bacup.

ANNIVERSARIES.

SUNDAY SCHOOL ANNIVERSARY.—On Lord's-day, May 22nd, two sermons were preached in Irwell-terrace Baptist Chapel, Bacup, by the Rev. E. Parker, of Farsley, near Leeds, to very numerous audiences. The collections amounted to upwards of £20.

OGDEN SUNDAY SCHOOL, NEAR ROCHDALE.—On Lord's-day, May 15th, two sermons were preached on behalf of the above school, afternoon and evening, by the Rev. J. Harvey, of Little Leigh, Cheshire. The attendance was good, and the collections amounted to £35. Unto God be all the praise.

BAPTISMS.

BARNES-STREET CHAPEL, ACCRINGTON.—On Lord's-day evening, June 5th, six females were baptised, in the above chapel, by Mr. W. E. Jackson, of Church. The occasion was more than ordinarily interesting from the fact that they were the first who have been immersed within its walls, previous candidates having been under the necessity of going to neighbouring churches. This had long been a source of grief; but now our hearts are made glad by being able to witness the administration of the ordinance in our own chapel. On Sunday, June 12th, they received the right hand of fellowship, and were admitted to full communion by Mr. Nichols, of Sunnyside.

BRAMLEY.—June 1st, one; June 5th, four; by Mr. Ashworth.

BELIZE.—March 6th, two males and four females; April 10th, two males; May 8th, three males; by Mr. A. Henderson, in the Belize river.

LATCHFORD.—On Sunday, June 4th, two persons were baptised after a sermon from Acts x. 47, 48. It was a "time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord."

OGDEN, NEAR ROCHDALE.—On Sunday, May 22nd, Mr. Nuttall baptised two believers, who were added to the church the first Sabbath in June.

SALENDINE NOOK.—1863: June, 5; December, 4. 1864: February, 2; March, 1; June, 2. By Mr. D. Crumpton.

WILMOT-STREET, MANCHESTER.—On Lord's-day, May 29th, after an appropriate discourse on Gal. iii. 27, our pastor baptised a young man (the brother of a much esteemed Baptist minister in this county), who has been a regular hearer of the Word and a teacher in our Sabbath school for some years past. He was received into the communion of our church on Lord's-day evening, June 5th. We pray that he who has now put on Christ may be enabled truly to "walk in him."

RECEIVED FOR BAPTIST EVANGELICAL SOCIETY.

Per Rev. P. Prout.	£	s.	d.
Mr. J. Broughton, Accrington	0	5	0
Mr. D. Bury, ,,	0	5	0
Mr. J. Chadwick, ,,	0	3	0
Mr. R. Fish, ,,	0	2	6
Mr. J. Carter, ,,	0	2	6
Mr. S. Sykes, ,,	0	2	6
Mr. J. Marsh, ,,	0	2	6
Mrs. Catlow, ,,	0	2	6
Miss Pilkington, ,,	0	2	6
Mr. R. Westwell, ,,	0	2	0
Mr. G. Holden, ,,	0	2	0
Mr. T. Entwistle, ,,	0	0	6
Rev. R. Cameron, Blackburn	0	10	0
Mrs. Baron, ,,	0	5	0
Mr. G. Walker, ,,	0	5	0
Mr. J. Charnley, ,,	0	2	6
Mr. T. Marsden, ,,	0	2	6